

1 P. Kristofer Strojnik, SBN 242728
2 pstrojnik@strojniklaw.com
3 Esplanade Center III, Suite 700
4 2415 East Camelback Road
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
6 415-450-0100 (tel.)

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 THERESA BROOKE, a married woman
11 dealing with her sole and separate claim,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 SALONI INC., a California corporation,

15 Defendant.

Case No:

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)

16 Plaintiff alleges:

17 **PARTIES**

18 1. Plaintiff Theresa Brooke is a married woman. Plaintiff is legally disabled,
19 and is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2),
20 the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 et seq., the
21 California Unruh Civil Rights Act. Plaintiff ambulates with the aid of a wheelchair due
22 to the loss of a leg.

23 2. Defendant, Saloni Inc., owns and/or operates and does business as the
24 hotel Super 8 by Wyndham North Hollywood located at 7541 Laurel Canyon
25 Boulevard, North Hollywood, California 91605. Defendant's hotel is a public
26 accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(A), which offers public lodging
27
28

1 services. On information and belief, Defendant's hotel was built or renovated after
2 March 15, 2012.

3 **JURISDICTION**

4 3. Jurisdiction in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 42
5 U.S.C. § 12188.

6 4. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district and
7 Defendant does substantial business in this judicial district.

8 5. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c)
9 in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions
10 giving rise to the claims occurred.

11 6. Pursuant to *Arroyo v. Rosas*, supplemental jurisdiction is appropriate over
12 Plaintiff's Unruh claim. On a case-specific analysis, there are no compelling reasons to
13 decline jurisdiction.

14 **ALLEGATIONS**

15 7. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's hotel does not have a compliant access
16 aisle at the passenger loading zone adjacent to the hotel lobby in violation of Sections
17 209 and 503 of the 2010 Standards. An access aisle has specific requirements to be
18 compliant with the Standards: It must be (1) 60 inches wide and at least 20 feet long, (2)
19 it must have an accessible route adjoining it, and (3) it cannot be within a vehicular
20 way. Section 503.3.

21 8. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant's disabled parking spots are not in
22 compliance with Section 208.3 of the Standards because they are not positioned at the
23 shortest possible route to the accessible main entrance.

24 9. The requirement for an access aisle at a passenger loading zone is
25 immensely important for a person in a wheelchair such as Plaintiff, as it provides safe
26 access to the entry of the hotel and deters others from placing encumbrances or
27 obstacles there such as a vehicle parking. An access aisle is akin to a cross-walk for
28

1 pedestrians. Absence of an access aisle where required creates dangerous conditions for
2 a person in a wheelchair such as Plaintiff.

3 10. Plaintiff formerly worked in the hospitality industry. She and her husband
4 are avid travelers to California for purposes of leisure travel and to “test” whether
5 various hotels comply with disability access laws. Testing is encouraged by the Ninth
6 Circuit.

7 11. Plaintiff and her husband traveled to Los Angeles in late August 2023 for
8 testing ADA compliance and leisure travel. She anticipates lodging at and has concrete
9 plans to lodge at Defendant’s hotel in February 2024, but if she arrives and the barriers
10 have not been fixed, she will not lodge there.

11 12. During this trip, Plaintiff personally visited Defendant’s hotel.
12 Defendant’s hotel has a passenger loading zone because pickup and dropoff occurs
13 there and it is located directly outside of the lobby entrance. There are also design
14 features showing an intent for utilization as a passenger loading zone. For example,
15 there is a *porte cochere*, which by definition is a design feature for passenger loading
16 zones. According to the U.S. Access Board Technical Guidelines on Passenger Loading
17 Zones, passenger loading zones are so common at hotels that even it recognizes “many
18 hotel entrances” have the design features indicating an intent to utilize as PLZs.

19 13. While at Defendant’s hotel, she discovered that Defendant’s hotel has a
20 barrier to entry to the lobby, which is that the passenger loading zone does not have an
21 access aisle compliant with Section 503.3. It is an absolute requirement to have an
22 access aisle at a passenger loading zone pursuant to Sections 209 and 503. The
23 requirement of an access aisle at a passenger loading zone relates to Plaintiff’s
24 disability of not having one leg and being forced to use a wheelchair because access
25 aisles are required so persons in a wheelchair can maneuver without threat of danger
26 from other vehicles and without other encumbrances obstructing their pathway. The
27 lobby, therefore, is inaccessible to Plaintiff by way of the passenger loading zone
28 because there is no access aisle.

1 14. As an alternative to stopping in the passenger loading zone, Plaintiff
2 looked for disabled parking spots. However, the Hotel's disabled parking spots were not
3 placed closest to the Hotel main entrance. Instead, standard, non-disabled parking spots
4 were closest to the Hotel main entrance. Section 208.3 of the 2010 Standards requires
5 that disabled parking spots be placed at the shortest possible route to the accessible
6 entrance, but Defendant instead placed non-disabled parking spots at the shortest
7 possible route. Plaintiff therefore was further deterred because the disabled parking
8 spots were not positioned to be the shortest possible route to the Hotel main entrance,
9 which double-downed on Defendant's limitation on access to the main entrance (access
10 aisle, *supra*).

11 15. Plaintiff gained actual and personal knowledge of a barrier while visiting
12 Defendant's hotel (no access aisle at passenger loading zone), and as a result, she was
13 deterred from entering the hotel both from the barrier and due to the lack of equality.
14 She anticipates returning to this hotel and has concrete plans to do so in February 2024
15 (see above), but she will only lodge at the hotel if, when she arrives, Defendant has
16 fixed the barrier. Visiting otherwise would be futile because the lack of the access aisle
17 represents a barrier to entering the lobby.

18 16. It is readily achievable and inexpensive to modify the hotel to provide an
19 access aisle, which involves painting and measuring tools.

20 17. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff and others will continue to be unable to
21 independently use Defendant's hotel in violation of her rights under the ADA.

22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 18. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations heretofore set forth.

24 19. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and others in that it has
25 failed to make its public lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable
26 by, individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) and §
27 12182(b)(2)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above.
28

1 20. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff in that it has failed to
2 remove architectural barriers to make its lodging services fully accessible to, and
3 independently usable by individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C.
4 §12182(b)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above. Compliance with the
5 2010 Standards would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendant's lodging
6 services nor result in an undue burden to Defendant.

7 21. In violation of the 2010 Standards, Defendant's hotel passenger loading
8 zone does not have a disability access aisle compliant with Section 503.3 of the
9 Standards.

10 22. Compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards,
11 as described above, is readily achievable by the Defendant. *Id.* Readily achievable
12 means that providing access is easily accomplishable without significant difficulty or
13 expense.

14 23. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and Plaintiff invokes her statutory right
15 to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

16 24. Without the requested injunctive relief, Defendant's non-compliance with
17 the ADA's requirements that its passenger loading zone be fully accessible to, and
18 independently useable by, disabled people is likely to recur.

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 20 a. Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant
21 was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA
22 described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the ADA;
23 b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR §
24 36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its
25 passenger loading zone into full compliance with the requirements set
26 forth in the ADA;
27 c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;
28 d. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and
appropriate.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

25. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations heretofore set forth.

26. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and others in that it has failed to make its public lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) and § 12182(b)(2)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above.

27. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff in that it has failed to remove architectural barriers to make its lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable by individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above. Compliance with the 2010 Standards would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendant's lodging services nor result in an undue burden to Defendant.

28. In violation of the 2010 Standards, Defendant's disabled parking spots are not positioned at the shortest possible route to the main entrance of the Hotel in violation of Section 208.3 of the Standards.

29. Compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above, is readily achievable by the Defendant. *Id.* Readily achievable means that providing access is easily accomplishable without significant difficulty or expense.

30. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and Plaintiff invokes her statutory right to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.

31. Without the requested injunctive relief, Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA's requirements that its disabled parking spots and Hotel entrance be fully accessible to, and independently useable by, disabled people is likely to recur.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the ADA;

- b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR § 36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its disabled parking spots into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA;
- c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;
- d. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and appropriate.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

32. Plaintiff realleges all allegations heretofore set forth.

33. Defendant has violated the Unruh by denying Plaintiff equal access to its public accommodation on the basis of her disability as outlined above.

34. Unruh provides for declaratory and monetary relief to "aggrieved persons" who suffer from discrimination on the basis of their disability.

35. Plaintiff has been damaged by the Defendant's non-compliance with Unruh.

36. Pursuant to Cal Civ. Code §52, Plaintiff is further entitled to such other relief as the Court considers appropriate, including monetary damages in an amount of \$4,000.00, and not more.

37. Pursuant to Unruh, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees and costs in an amount to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant was in violation of the specific requirements of Unruh; and
- b. Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR § 36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its passenger loading zone and disabled parking spaces into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA;
- c. Payment of costs and attorney's fees;
- d. Damages in the amount of \$8,000.00; and

1 e. Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and
2 appropriate.

3 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

4 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on issues triable by a jury.

5 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 4th day of September, 2023.

6 /s/ P. Kristofer Strojnik

7 P. Kristofer Strojnik (242728)

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 **VERIFICATION**

10 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

11 DATED this 4th day of September, 2023.

12
13 

14
15
16 Theresa Marie Brooke